DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 259 754 IR 051 199

AUTHOR Shelton, Diana; And Others
TITLE Report of the Task Force on Allocations Practices.
INSTITUTION Wyoming Univ., Laramie. Univ. Libraries.
PUB DATE May 85
NOTE 65p.; For related documents, see IR 051 197-203.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Budgeting; College Libraries; Financial Support; Higher Education; History; *Improvement Programs; Library Acquisition; *Library Collection Development; *Library Expenditures; Library Materials; Needs Assessment; Nonprint Media; Online Systems; Operations Research; Records (Forms); *Resource Allocation; Serials
IDENTIFIERS Association of Research Libraries; *University of Wyoming

ABSTRACT

This task force report examines the University of Wyoming's current allocation practices, the allocations themselves, and the expenditure process according to how effectively they support the university library's collection development goals. Individual aspects of the current allocation process are reviewed, including the university budget planning process; the process of internal allocations and expenditures of library materials funds, particularly approval plans, serials/monographs, format, location, and non-material allocations; and the process of obligation and expenditure of allocated funds. Strengths and weaknesses of the current allocations and expenditure process are discussed. Recommendations are presented for allocations, use of qualitative data to establish subject allocations, subject specialist/liaison responsibility for allocation expenditures, allocation by subject, nonprint formats, approval plans, serials/periodicals allocations, internal library allocations, payment of non-material fees from acquisitions funds, and an automated online acquisitions system. The formal charge of the Task Force on Allocations Practices, annual allocation procedure schedule, summary of factors of major allocations formulas, allocation request forms, suggested subject categories for library allocations, and a list of automated acquisitions system features are appended. (MBR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED259754

UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING LIBRARIES

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON ALLOCATIONS PRACTICES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

May 1985

TASK FORCE ON ALLOCATIONS PRACTICES

Diana Shelton, Chair
Joanne Bessler
Larry Jansen
Meredith Merritt
Cyndi Patras
Bill Van Arsdale
Jim Walsh

IR051199

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol A. Collier

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1
University Budget Planning Process 2
Budget Periods 3
Budget Calendar 3
Budget Planning Procedures 4
Budget Request Preparation and Review 4
Internal Allocation and Expenditure of Library Materials Funds 5
Allocation History 5
Allocation Criteria 7
Allocation Process 8
Individual Areas of Concern 10
Approval Plans 10
Serials/Monographs 11
Format 12
Location 12
Non-material Allocations 13
Obligation and Expenditure of Funds 13
Fund Accounting Reports 15
Serials/Periodicals 16
"Big Money Items" 16
Strengths and Weaknesses of the Current Allocations and Expenditure Process 17
Strengths 17
Weaknesses 18
Recommendations 22
Allocations 22
Use of Quantitative Data to Establish Subject Allocations 23
Subject Specialist/Liaison Responsibility for Allocation Expenditure 25
Allocation by Subject 27
Non-print Formats 28
Approval Plans 30
Serials/Periodicals Allocations 32
Internal Library Allocations 34
Payment of Non-material Charges/Fees from Acquisition Funds 38
Automated Online Acquisitions Systems 41
Appendices
A. Charge to the Task Force on Allocations Practices 43
B. Bessler-Keiter Allocation Formula 45
C. Continuing Obligations - FY 1984 47
D. Annual Allocation Procedure Schedule 48
E. Summary of Factors and Characteristics of Some Major Allocations Formulas 49
F. Factors to be Considered in the Formula 51
G. Book Fund Allocation Request Form 53
H. Suggested Subject Categories for Library Allocations 57
I. Internal Library Accounts 58
J. Monographs, Serials, Access to Information - FY 1984 60
K. Automated Acquisitions System Features 61
Notes 62

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON ALLOCATIONS PRACTICES

INTRODUCTION

The Task Force on Allocations Practices was charged with examining the current allocation process, the allocations themselves, and the expenditure process. After analyzing the data collected, the second charge of the Task Force was to recommend changes in order to improve the present system. The Study Team charge to the Task Force is included as Appendix A. Task Force members were Diana Shelton, Chair, Joanne Bessler, Larry Jansen, Meredith Merritt, Cyndi Patras, Bill Van Arsdale, and Jim Walsh.

Because very little information about the allocations process exists in written form, the investigation was based on interviews with individuals involved: the Director of Libraries, the Associate Director for Technical Services, the Head of Acquisitions, and the Head of Collection Development. An interview with Joyce Scott, at the time the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, focused on the University budget process in which the Library participates. Some related preliminary data was included in the Collection Analysis Project Interim Report. Opinions of library subject specialist/liaisons were acquired through selected questions in the "Survey of Subject Specialists/ Departmental Liaisons" sent out by the Task Force on Organization and Staffing. A summary of the survey results is appended to the report of the Task Force on Organization on Staffing.

The Task Force evaluated the current process according to how effectively it supports collection development goals, focusing on the

purpose expressed in the Collection Analysis Project Interim Report.[1] The primary purpose of collection development activities is to support the instructional and research programs of the University. The secondary purpose is to support the information needs and general advancement of learning of the people of Wyoming. As more precise collection development goals are developed, allocations should support these goals and become part of the process for implementing them. Allocations should also provide budget control and permit the Library to be accountable to the University for the obligation and expenditure of acquisitions funds.

Task Force members gathered data and reported on alternative allocations processes and on individual aspects of our current process. Based on these activities and further analysis several recommendations are made to improve the present process to make it more supportive of collection development goals.

UNIVERSITY BUDGET PLANNING PROCESS

The Library presents a biennial budget request to the University administration in the spring of the year preceeding the Legislature's budget session. The Library is almost exclusively supported by state funds; acquisitions purchases are supported by Legislative appropriations. Library budget requests must be based on defensible needs and realistic expectations if they are to survive University review and be presented to the Legislature for consideration. Documented accountability for and wise management of the Legislative appropriations contributes to the credibility of the Library before the administration

nd the Legislature.

Budget Periods

The University operates on a biennial cycle, making operating and capital requests to the Legislative budget session which is convened in even numbered years. In odd-numbered years the Legislature considers non-budget issues, and only emergency appropriations are considered. Fiscal year (FY) dates cited in this report refer to the end of the fiscal year; i.e. FY 84 is the period July 1, 1983 through June 30, 1984, or more pertinent to biennial budgets, FY 85-86 describes the biennial budget period of July 1, 1984 through June 30, 1986.

Budget Calendar

The budget planning process begins 18 months before the budget takes effect (i.e. FY 87-88 planning began in January 1985). One year later it is submitted to the Legislature for approval. A typical calendar may be as follows:

January 1985	- Planning guidelines for preparing the 87-88 biennial budget and University plan for allocating FY 86 budget distributed to operational units (colleges and divisions).
March 20	- FY 87-88 requests due to the University administration.
April 1 to May 15	- UW Budget Planning Committee review of budget requests. Also, clarification and negotiation by deans and directors.
June 1 to July 1	- Distribution of FY 86 budget, and decisions on FY 87-88 requests.
September	- Trustees consider FY 87-88 budget request.
January 1986	- Legislature considers FY 87-88 budget request.

Budget Planning Prodecures

Each college and division develops budget plans for all activities for the biennium using the current budget as the base. Requests for additional funding must meet the guidelines for expanded requests set by the administration. For FY 87-88 those guidelines were 1) that a current activity could not be sustained at the current level of operations within the base budget (such is the case for the Library's acquisitions budget) or 2) that a unit planned expanded activities or anticipated expanded enrollments during the biennium. The dean or director of each unit then reviews all requests and forwards approved requests to the planning coordinator, for distribution to the appropriate vice presidential office (Academic Affairs, in the case of the Library). The Vice Presidents' recommendations are submitted to the Budget Planning Committee, which makes recommendations to the President, who in turn recommends to the Trustees. The President and selected staff then begin discussions and negotiations, first with the Joint Appropriations Committee of the Legislature and ultimately with the full Legislature.

Budget Request Preparation and Review

Basic direction for budget requests begins with the University Purpose Statement, the Long-Range Academic Plan, and departmental review documents. Additionally, institutional priorities have been provided by the planning coordinator. In the FY 85-86 biennium the University operated under 13 priorities. The Library's acquisitions request neatly conformed to the number one priority, "instructional needs for courses meeting University-wide General Education requirements

or supporting most undergraduate major programs...will have high priority for personnel and support needs."[2]

In addition to institutional priorities, "decision-making principles" have been applied to each request. Examples of these principles are: "All requests for expanded funds will be assessed by evaluating past and current effective utilization of such funds," and "New programs will normally be implemented by a phased-in approach rather than an initial full-funding approach."[3]

INTERNAL ALLOCATION AND EXPENDITURE OF LIBRARY MATERIALS FUNDS

Allocation History

Traditionally, the University of Wyoming Library has had limited funds for acquisitions. As a result the collection is weak in retrospective holdings for most disciplines. Three years ago, the Legislature doubled the materials budget from $1,154,762 in FY 82 to $2,312,117 in FY 83, allowing the Library to add approximately 40,000 volumes instead of the previous 20,000 per year. With this doubling of funds came the understanding that the budget would receive inflationary increases to the base, enabling the Library to maintain a 40,000 volume per year level of acquisitions. In the single budget period that has followed, the acquisitions appropriations were adjusted to allow continuation of a 40,000 volume level.

Little written documentation exists relative to the allocations process prior to FY 79; because personnel have changed, oral history is unavailable. The process seems to have been handled by the Director of

Libraries. During the early 1970's the Faculty Senate Library Committee may have taken a more active advisory role in Library matters, including allocations.[4]

Allocations traditionally have been divided between internal library accounts and external departmental accounts. Because funds were limited, allocations were small and increments were based on amounts granted the previous year. The Task Force could locate no information about how or when the original allocations began.

Two major changes in the pattern of allocations have occurred in recent years. In FY 81, serial and periodical funds were removed from departmental accounts and placed in a general library fund. At that time serial costs were consuming most, and in some cases all, of many departmental accounts. After removing serials, departments were allocated the amount remaining for monograph purchases or given a token $500 allocation if the balance was zero. An across-the-board 10% increase was granted to departmental accounts in FY 82.

The next major change occured in 1982. A Task Force on Acquisitions and Allocations, consisting of Library and faculty representatives, devised a formula upon which to base the FY 83 allocations, the first year under the increased acquisitions budget. (See Appendix B.) The base formula figures were modified extensively before the Task Force recommendations were made and implemented. This was the first and only attempt to modify historic allocation amounts and in itself has become the basis for further modifications. The formula and data have not been updated.

The 1982 Task Force endorsed the concept that internal Library accounts, especially those covering approval plans, serials and periodicals, are high priority accounts. If allocation reductions are required, departmental accounts should be modified before adjustments are made to these internal accounts which represent ongoing commitments.

Many of the internal accounts represent continuing obligations. The Head of Acquisitions has primary responsibility for spending most of these funds, including: approval, binding, Center for Research Libraries (CRL) membership, Online Computer Library Center Inc. (OCLC) deposit, periodicals, new periodical subscriptions, serials, new serial subscriptions and technical service tools. The amount of funds committed on a continuing basis has been increasing; these accounts currently consume over half of the acquisitions funds. In FY 84 they accounted for almost $1,400,000 out of the total $2,500,000 expenditures. (See Appendix C.) Even with the increased acquisitions budget, the percentage available for other funds is decreasing, leaving the Library less flexibility in collection development.

Allocation Criteria

Allocations have generally been based on historical amounts, particularly the amount spent during the year immediately preceding. Since FY 83, departmental allocations have been partially based on the formula developed by the Task Force on Acquisitions and Allocations, although each year allocations have been based less on the formula. New programs and special library projects, such as Books for College Libraries (BCL), Sheehy, or the Blackwell/North America (B/NA)

retrospective project, have resulted in specific funds which have been allocated for only one or two years.

Allocation Process

The Director of Libraries has the authority to grant final approval to the allocation of funds. The actual development of the figures is delegated to the Associate Director for Technical Services, who in turn delegates the task to the Head of Acquisitions. Before the Director gives final approval, the figures are presented to the Administrative Council for discussion and recommendations. Administrative Council members may in turn ask members of their staffs for suggestions and recommendations. Once the allocation amounts have been determined, the director is responsible for sending a letter of notification to all departments informing them of their individual allocations. Information about other departments' allocations can be provided if requested, but this rarely occurs.

Work on allocations for the various funds usually begins in mid-Spring, often before the exact amount to be available is known. The deadline for allocation of internal accounts is June 30; a substantial invoice has to be paid during the first week in July. The deadline for departmental accounts is late August, so that faculty can be notified of their allocations by the time the Fall semester begins. Every year there have been variations in allocations caused by different factors.

Staff in the Collection Development Department have played a very minor role in the allocation process. The Head of Collection Development has advised the Head of Acquisitions and was a member of the 1982 Task Force on Allocations and Acquisitions.

The subject specialist/liaison program has been partially implemented beginning in FY 84; for the first time, at the request of the Administrative Council, individuals serving as subject specialist/liaisons were asked individually by the Head of Acquisitions to make allocation recommendations. This consultation was requested following an initial recommendation made by the Head of Acquisitions, based on partial expenditures and obligations from FY 83. Other librarians have also been consulted and have recommended allocations for internal accounts for which they have responsibility.

Faculty members in academic departments have not been routinely involved in the annual allocation process, but they have participated in ordering material to be purchased from departmental allocations. Departments have adopted differing internal procedures to expend allocations: some have a particular faculty member responsible, some suballocate to individual faculty members and some have department members submit orders to the department's secretary, who in turn sends them to the Library. Some departments spend funds aggressively and request more, while others spend little. The Library has not taken an active role in obligating departmental allocations; one of the consequences of this pattern is that the Library's subject collections have developed unevenly. Because past expenditure of funds has been a major factor in allocations, this uneven development is continually reinforced. When funds were so limited that purchase of only the most basic materials was possible, this situation was not as problematic as it is now, when funds are available to build collections that will be more balanced and more responsive to the University's research and instruction needs.

If departmental allocations are not obligated by a deadline, the Library does take responsibility for seeing that funds are obligated. Any unobligated departmental funds revert to the Library reserve account and can be used for material purchases which may or may not be related to the individual department's needs.

Faculty members submit requests and justifications for the purchase of new serials and periodicals. Recently these requests have been examined by individual subject specialist/liaisons, who gather pertinent information and approve or reject the order request. Items exceeding certain price limitations are submitted for approval to the Collection Development Committee. Thus, for new subscriptions which are funded through an internal account, the responsibility is shared by the faculty and library personnel.

Individual Areas of Concern

Included within the general allocation and expenditure system are some individual areas that the Task Force was charged to examine.

Approval Plans

The University of Wyoming Library receives material from two major approval plans; the amount of material received in this manner has greatly expanded in the last few years. Beginning with calendar year 1983, the B/NA plan became subject-based, including material from several thousand publishers based in the United States. The Academic Book Center (ABC) plan is publisher-based, enabling the Library to receive almost all publications issued by a select number of major publishers, the number of which was expanded in 1982. The Majors plan

for medical publications was used only during 1984; beginning in 1985 B/NA again provides this material. The Head of Acquisitions estimates that the approval plans represent 60-65% of recently published monographs purchased, while 35-40% are from individual orders.[5] Before 1983, approval plan purchases represented only about 30% of the Library's total receipts of current monographs.

The approval plans enable the Library to spend money more efficiently in terms of staff time and to obtain items more quickly than if they were ordered individually. The Library is also able to obtain material more cheaply because discounts are higher.

Academic departments generally have ordered and continue to order current material. Since more of this is now arriving through approval plans, faculty members are finding it increasingly difficult to spend allocated money. Faculty orders for more retrospective or foreign material have been minimal so far, with most orders generated through internal library requests.[6] No systematic evaluation of the approval plans has been undertaken to determine if the Library is receiving what is expected, what portion of each subject area is being covered, or whether the profiles need to be adjusted.

Serials/Monographs

The ratio of serials to monographs was about 61% serials to 39% monographs prior to the FY 83 increase in acquisitions funds. Because most of this increase was allocated to monographs, the ratio changed dramatically to about 40% serials, 60% monographs. Serials allocations were 41% for FY 84. (See Appendix J.) The "monograph" budget includes everything except serials. Non-material expenses such as OCLC and CRL

fees come from the "monograph" budget, so the percent of acquisitions funds actually spent on monographs is less than it appears to be. The number of serial standing orders in the Library was 11,127 for FY 83, below the Association for Research Libraries (ARL) median of 19,943, but above the low ARL figure of 8,718.[7] Serials represent a continuing obligation and one that tends to increase more rapidly than other expenses because of higher inflation rates, thereby consuming an ever-increasing percentage of the total acquisitions budget. If serials expenses exceed 55-66% of the acquisitions budget, concern develops about maintaining an adequate level of monograph purchases.[8]

Format

The Library recognizes that for needed information, content is more important than format, but that adequate delivery systems must be available for information in non-print formats, including films, maps and data tapes. Balancing these two needs requires planning and deliberate decisions. The Library lacks appropriate facilities for storage, preservation, and use of audio-visual materials. Since the Library is still working to improve support for curriculum and research needs by building up basic serial and book resources, care must be taken not to weaken the collection of these basic print formats in order to build collections in other formats.

Location

Some funds for off campus sites are allocated by location rather than subject; however, there is no consistent pattern for these allocations and there does not seem to be any trend. Delivery of information

is the basic function f[illegible] each fund, although the particular arrangement may vary. The University of Wyoming/National Park Service Research Center in Jackson, Wyoming, has a separate allocation in the Library acquisitions budget. Casper has had an independent legislated fund, which is becoming more responsive to Library direction. Financial support for the College of Education field office collections is decreasing. The acquisitions Outreach allocation started in FY 84 as an umbrella fund for suport of off-campus programs. Because each of these allocations by location varies, there is no focus for considering them together as a major problem.

Non-material Allocations

Acquisitions funds are allocated for items, including OCLC fees and CRL membership, that are only indirectly related to the acquisition of materials, although they may be more directly related to acquisition of information. Approval has been granted by University administrators for each of these special funds. Increasing costs for the items have an impact on the acquisitions budget by reducing the amount available to purchase materials.

Obligation and Expenditure of Funds

The obligation and expenditure of allocated funds is a process related to but differing from the allocation process itself. Once the budget is allocated to various funds, the next steps in the process are to obligate (commit or bind money for purchases) and then to expend the funds. It is possible to carry money over from the first to the second year of the biennium, but all funds must be expended by September 30

following the end of the second year of the biennium (June 30 of even-numbered years). That deadline has passed for the first biennium of the expanded acquisitions budget.

The Library continues to obligate funds from internal accounts through the June 30 fiscal year end. It imposes an earlier cut-off date for departmental orders. The amount of money available to spend and the year within the biennium influence this cut-off date, which has varied from March 1 to April 15. The time following this deadline is used for processing the orders and for obligating funds against departmental accounts. After most orders are processed, remaining departmental funds are transferred to the reserve fund and expended by Library staff primarily for expensive items which have been requested by either faculty members or librarians throughout the year. There are no preliminary deadlines before the cut-off date, although fund balances are monitored by the Head of Acquisitions, the Head of Technical Services and, beginning in FY 85, by some subject specialists and informal encouragement to spend the money is given. The Director is ultimately responsible for the expenditure of funds, but relies on the Head of Acquisitions to actually spend the acquisitions funds. Library department heads who are responsible for various internal accounts are accountable as managers for expending those funds. Although subject specialists have authority to order items charged to departmental allocations, they serve mainly as facilitators and prompters for departmental ordering.

Fund Accounting Reports

The Acquisitions Department currently uses a local, batch-mode fund accounting system called LARS (Library Acquisitions Reporting System). Several problems exist within this system because it has third priority at the University of Wyoming Computer Center, following Administration (Payroll) and Registration/Admissions; at certain times reports are delayed. Instead of being online, keypunched cards are used, a system the University plans to discontinue within a few years. Because LARS is a single-entry accounting system, funds from the first year of the biennium are mixed with those of the second, a poor accounting practice which obscures annual expenditures. This fund accounting system is the only automated record-keeping system used in acquisitions, other than the acquisitions module of the LINX system. LINX is an online system used for ordering, checking-in and claiming serials and periodicals; it was developed by Faxon, a major national company that handles serials orders for libraries.

Several LARS reports are generated. Each academic department receives a monthly cumulative list of items ordered from departmental allocations. This report also gives a breakdown of funds, dividing them into expended, obligated or free balance categories. Subject specialists and other interested library personnel may receive copies of these if they request them. A cumulated monthly list of all orders is also generated. A weekly budget summary for each individual account is distributed within the library to those requesting it. Periodic lists of serial and periodical orders are also generated and distributed to those requesting them. Many other LARS reports are used in

the Acquisitions Department for accounting purposes.

Because the production of LARS reports and the data included therein is often delayed, it does not provide an accurate method for maintaining awareness of actual obligations and expenditures in various accounts. The lack of timeliness in accounting reports is one of the reasons the Library has not set sub-deadlines for obligating funds in individual accounts.

Serials/Periodicals

Serial and periodical funds are expended throughout the year with no deadline. The major Faxon invoice for serials and periodicals is paid early in July in order to obtain a substantial discount, which is applied to funding the automated LINX system. Two other major expenditures occur in December and April. All serials are obligated each year, but some are paid on a multi-year basis rather than annually; this practice results in reversion of serial funds to the reserve account late in the fiscal year.

New serials and periodicals are ordered throughout the year, although the recommended procedure is to group most orders twice a year, in July and December. Expensive serial and periodical orders are reviewed by the Collection Development Committee. Less expensive orders are placed by subject specialists or members of the Collection Development Committee, frequently at the request of faculty members.

"Big Money Items"

Expensive items costing from several hundred to several thousand dollars, have traditionally been purchased toward the end of the fiscal

year using funds left in other accounts, primarily departmental or serial accounts. The Head of Acquisitions keeps a file of "Big Money Items" suggested throughout the year or carried over from previous years. The expected procedure is that the Heads of Acquisitions and Collection Development and the Collection Development Committee discuss the requests and recommend purchases to the Director for approval; the actual procedure has varied in practice each year. There is usually time pressure to spend the money. There has been no plan for spreading the purchase of expensive items or collections throughout the fiscal year and little money available throughout the year to spend on these items. There has been no systematic assignment of priorities or effort to relate expenditures to collection development goals or policies.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE CURRENT ALLOCATIONS AND EXPENDITURES PROCESS

Strengths

1. Allocations to departments and shared responsibility with faculty for spending funds encourage faculty involvement in collection building. Department allocations can be correlated with department needs and strengths.
2. Allocations provide spending limits.
3. The Library is totally responsible for the majority of acquisitions funds through the internal library accounts.
4. Allocation by format or type such as films, video tapes and serials, allows monitoring and control of growth.
5. Duties have been defined for the two subject specialists whose

jobs include allocations of time in collection development have been defined. Subject specialists have been assigned in all areas.

6. Information about campus instructional programs, collection use and publishing statistics has been gathered one time in 1982 and used as a preliminary basis for allocations.
7. Broad approval plans provide an efficient and economical way to purchase current materials.
8. The fund accounting system is free of cost and is already developed. The system does function; funds are spent within the time allowed and they are spent mainly for materials supporting University instructional and research programs.

Weaknesses

1. The Library has responsibility for all acquisition funds. However, because the Library has sub-allocated funds into departmental accounts, which are used by faculty to order materials, there is a perception that departmental funds are the responsibility of the departments until the order cut-off date. The lack of common understanding regarding responsibility for departmental allocations makes the entire expenditure process unclear and more difficult to administer and monitor. Final allocation figures for departments were late for FY 85. Approval plan acquisitions are not considered when formulating department allocations. The most serious weakness related to allocations to departments is that the Library does not have the basic flexibility to build and balance

the monographic collection. Allocations do not necessarily address weak areas in the collections.

2. Allocations for audio-visual formats other than films and video tapes are not available by format and no audio-visual material can be purchased through the departmental allocations.
3. Duties of the subject specialist/liaisons related to allocations are not clearly defined and the individuals lack training. Even the two specialists with major responsibilities have individually developed their own methods. Subject specialists' formal authority for spending departmental allocations has been unclear.
4. There has been no systematic review of the approval plans in order to determine whether the Library is receiving the material it expects, whether the profile needs revision, or how materials received through the plans fit into the Library's subject collections. The current approval plan coverage is unclear to many people in the Library and to the faculty.
5. The information that was gathered for the formula devised by the Task Force on Allocations and Acquisitions was a one-time effort; it has not been updated or revised. Once or twice a year Interlibrary Loan (ILL) has reported those journals for which the number of requests has exceeded the copyright guideline limits. Members of the Collection Development Committee have ordered the most needed titles. Other ILL data which may be of use for collection development have been made available only since November 1984. Shelving statistics broken down by major call number are available but have not yet been requested or used for

collection development purposes. Allocations, both internal and external, have been primarily based on past expenditures.

6. Data in the fund accounting system, LARS, is not timely and future projections indicate it will become increasingly slow. Subject specialists have not been aware of what reports are available and are confused about the meaning of data. The system covers fund accounting only. Other acquisitions processes are not substantially automated. Information about unprocessed orders is unavailable, making fund obligation estimates impossible. The ability to estimate would be particularly useful as the ordering deadline approaches.

7. There is no procedure for the systematic review of standing orders for serials and periodicals, either for recent subscriptions or for older orders. There is no system for balancing new standing orders to insure that they will contribute appropriately to general collection development.

8. The Library has over-obligated for serials and periodicals by obligating for each standing order each year, even though some items do not require annual payment. Late in each fiscal year this practice has resulted in large sums of money becoming available that must be obligated rapidly. Money also reverts from other funds and becomes available near the end of the fiscal year. At this time expensive items are purchased, with most funds coming from reversions which are not available throughout the year. Systematic, continuing priorities which would allow these purchases to support a collection development plan have not

been set. Expensive purchases are not tied to a subject account, so it is difficult to evaluate how much is actually spent to support particular collections.

9. Non-material, information-producing expenditures come from the acquisitions budget. Individual expenditures have been carefully planned and justified to the University administration. An overview of these expenditures and their current and projected impact on the acquisitions budget has not been undertaken.

10. The Collection Development Department has little involvement in the allocation process. There is also lack of systematic input by subject specialist/liaisons, and the communications system is poorly developed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Allocations

Allocation amounts should reflect collection development needs and should be related to and support collection development goals and policies. The current procedure does not clearly relate allocation of funds to collection development goals and policies for several reasons. Goals and policies have not been well developed. The Head of Acquisitions has been developing preliminary allocations figures; the Head of Collection Development has held an advisory role. Subject specialist/liaisons have had no formal channels for having input into the process. Data related to University programs, publishing trends and collection use have been collected only one time; these data have not been updated. The amount previously expended in each fund is a major factor in the following years' allocations.

Recommendation:

Beginning in 1986 for FY 87 the Collection Development Officer should develop preliminary allocation figures using necessary accounting figures provided by the Head of Acquisitions. The Library Director should continue to give final authorization for allocation of funds. During the Spring of 1985 the responsibility for developing the allocation figures for FY 86 should be shared by the Collection Development Officer and the Head of Acquisitions.

The allocation procedures should follow a definite schedule each year. Subject specialists individually and as a group should have input into the process before the preliminary figures are first presented

for approval. Beginning in 1986, the Collection Development Officer should develop and distribute a written schedule by February each year. This schedule should specify time and opportunity for input by subject specialists, the deadline for an evaluation of the previous year's allocation recommendation and dates when preliminary and final allocation recommendations are due. A suggested schedule is included in Appendix D.

In order to implement this recommendation, the Library Director by July 1, 1985, should assign the Collection Development Officer the responsibility for developing preliminary allocation figures.

2. Use of Quantitative Data to Establish Subject Allocations

Allocations should be based partly upon current objective data related to campus research and instruction programs, the publishing industry and collection use. As more collection assessments are undertaken and more subject policies are written indicating a required level of collecting, reliance on quantitative data will have relatively less importance for allocations. However, current information will remain useful and should continue to be made available in a structured manner.

Objective data gathering has been done systematically only one time by the 1982 Task Force on Acquisitions and Allocations. The data have not been updated. Past expenditure of funds, which may reinforce inequitable collection development, remains a major factor in new allocations.

In addition to the formula used as a partial base for the FY 83 allocations, the Task Force examined several other allocation formulas

that have appeared recently in library literature. (See Appendix E.) While a workable and reliable formula could be used as a base for more equitable and consistent allocations, none of these as currently developed appear to meet the Library's needs. More detailed work must be undertaken to determine if an actual formula is feasible.

Recommendation:

The Collection Development Officer should be responsible for insuring that the necessary data are collected, tabulated, and distributed to the appropriate subject specialist/liaisons by February 1 each year beginning in 1986. The data gathering process should take place annually and be completed late in the fall semester beginning in 1985. The different factors which should be considered and an example of an individual book allocations worksheet are included in Appendices F and G.

The development of a new flexible formula to be used as one of the bases for allocating funds among academic departments or subject categories is recommended. It should be the responsibility of the Collection Development Officer to oversee the development and implementation of the formula. By October 1985, the Collection Development Officer should present a written report to the Library Director, recommending a useful and practical form for presenting the data. If found feasible, a formula will be used with the budget of the first year of the next biennium, FY 87. Use of the University's Statistical Consulting Service during the development of the formula is advised, to verify validity of the formula structure. It is also recommended that the Library plan to have microcomputer resources capable of handling an

electronic spreadsheet program for the manipulation of the formula. One possible program would be Lotus 1-2-3, which can run on an IBM PC.

3. Subject Specialist/Liaison Responsibility for Allocation Expenditure

In any system of library allocations and material selection, teaching and research faculty must have an active role in recommending items for the collection. They have the necessary subject expertise to develop a collection within their areas of specialization as well as to suggest items in broader subject areas. Because building, balancing and managing a library collection is basically a library responsibility, subject specialist/liaisons should have the responsibility for obligating departmental or subject book allocation funds.

The subject specialist/liaison program is in the process of being developed. Responsibilities are being clarified and training is in process but not complete. Individuals in these positions have not had a reallocation of duties or clerical support that would allow them enough time to assume the responsibility for obligating departmental book allocation funds. Currently subject specialist/liaisons are able to monitor departmental funds and to obligate and expend from accounts after establishing their liaison role with the department. During FY 85 subject specialist/liaisons did begin to obligate some departmental funds.

Recommendation:

The Collection Development Officer should monitor the obligation and expenditure of the book allocations. At the time FY 86 allocations are announced the Collection Development Officer should issue written

guidelines for levels of obligating to all departments. The Task Force suggests that 50% of funds should be obligated or turned in to Acquisitions by December 1 and 70% by February 1. When the guidelines are issued, the Collection Development Officer should send a memo to subject specialist/liaisons stating that they will be expected to take an increasingly active role in ordering, particularly if expected levels of obligation are not being met or if the collection in an area needs to be strengthened. Because fewer faculty orders were submitted by several departments during the Fall of 1984, some subject specialist/liaisons already have begun to be more active in ordering.

In May 1986, following subject specialist training, reallocation of duties and provision of clerical support, and following communication with teaching faculty, subject specialists should be officially notified by the Director that they become responsible for the expenditure of departmental or subject allocations, beginning with FY 87. Faculty will retain an active role in selecting and recommending material.

In an effort to educate the faculty about the Library's increasing role in collection building and to emphasize the importance of continuing faculty recommendations, the Library administration must be responsible for basic communications. Some possible formats for communication include discussions with Academic Affairs, inging the matter before the Faculty Senate Library Committee, and informing the department heads and faculty members. Letters, newspaper articles and open meetings are all possibilities. These initial communications should be followed by more focused discussions and memos from the Collection Development Officer and individual subject specialists.

4. Allocation by Subject

Core literature tends to be interdisciplinary. The Library receives and organizes material based on a subject arrangement; allocating funds according to similar subject categories would be more objective and equitable than allocating to individual departments. The physical arrangement of the library subject collections also influences the management of them; subject specialist/liaisons should be from the library where the material is physically located.

The current system of allocations by individual academic departments is not always compatible with subject organization. Needs of independent research institutes are not easily identified. Departmental allocations also result in many small allocations which limit overall collection development flexibility. Subject specialist/liaisons' subject responsibilities vary widely from a part of one department to an entire college.

Recommendation:

Beginning with FY 87 the Task Force recommends that book allocations be made according to subject categories, with a library subject specialist/liaison being responsible for expending the funds for each category or group of similar categories. Related academic department faculty, whose input is essential to a well-informed and successful selection process, must continue to be active. During FY 86 the Collection Development Officer and the Director of Libraries should begin assigning subject specialists responsibility for subject related departments. In April 1986 the Collection Development Officer should present a written plan for implementing subject book allocations.

A list of suggested subject areas appropriate for allocation is included in Appendix H. This is only a proposed grouping; discussion and modifications are likely to take place during the planning and implementation phases.

5. Non-print Formats

Information is available in several non-print formats. Information content is more important than format, but different formats require the development of effective delivery systems.

Although the Library acquires primarily print materials, certain non-print materials are also acquired, such as data tapes, 16mm films and video tapes. All non-print formats currently being purchased come from special format allocations and have specific library staff members or committees to oversee purchases. Because of concern for space, equipment and service hours (particularly at Audio-Visual Services), other types of non-print materials currently are not being purchased with Library funds. Therefore, many departments have acquired needed non-print materials along with necessary supporting equipment from their own departmental budgets. Lack of any central coordination results in closet collections of inaccessible non-print material across the campus and proliferation of different types of audio-visual equipment. The Library is aware that the audio-visual material in question represents valuable sources of information, but at the present time poses so many problems that the situation demands caution. Past efforts to resolve these problems have not been notably successful due to the number of participants involved and the attendant political considerations.

Recommendation:

The Director of Libraries should continue discussions with other University officials for the purpose of resolving the current stalemate on location, service and equipment support for non-print materials. He should contribute to the efforts of the Instructional Services Committee to define the responsibilities of various units on campus, including the College of Education and the Library. A centralized campus service department for non-print materials equipment is recommended.

The Head of Audio-Visual Services should be responsible for organizing a campus survey to be distributed to faculty and staff during October 1985 to determine their needs and priorities for non-print material.

Within six months of finalization of the location and servicing of non-print materials, the Collection Development Officer should develop policies and procedures for acquiring all new audio-visual formats. Specific issue recommendations include:

1. Selection of audio-visual material should be substantially determined by types and formats of audio-visual equipment capable of being supported from the newly defined campus service department.
2. Audio-visual purchases should come from a general audio-visual allocation to allow for Library staff review of requests and to provide maximum flexibility. Any audio-visual request including film/video over $1,500 should come to the Library Collection Development Committee for discussion and decision.
3. Selection of non-print materials should also be related to appropriate subject selection policies and assessments.

6. Approval Plans

Approval plans enable the Library to acquire current publications more efficiently and to obtain items quickly while they remain in print. Higher discounts associated with approval plans enable material to be obtained more cheaply.

The expanded use of the approval plans for acquisition of needed currently published materials is having a major impact on the Library's collection development process. Because more current monographs are being received through approval plans, there is less need to order them individually through departmental funds. At the same time that approval plans are becoming increasingly the source for current materials, knowledge of exactly what is expected to come on approval continues to be a problem for both the subject specialist/liaisons and the faculty liaisons. The relative amount coming on approval in different subject areas has not been studied.

Recommendation:

In order to determine if the Library is receiving items that are expected, the Collection Development Officer should be responsibile for conducting a sample comparison of approval plan purchases with some standard source of evaluative reviews (such as Choice) for materials likely to be purchased by the Library. Both subject areas and publishers should be considered. The Collection Development Officer should provide written procedures before the start of the project. The comparison should be finished during November 1985. The Collection Development Officer should prepare a written report of the results by December 15, 1985. Future need for similar evaluations should be also addressed at the same time.

Beginning in 1985 the Collection Development Officer annually in August should consolidate the information available from the various approval plans to indicate a basic subject distribution of approval purchases. This data should be compared to the best available data on book publishing in the United States for the same time period in order to partially ascertain what portion of current scholarly publishing is being received through the approval plans. A written report of the results should be presented to the Director of Libraries and the subject specialist/liaisons by August 31 each year.

In order to increase the amount of available information related to acquisitions in subject areas, the Head of Acquisitions should change the LARS system by July 1985 to allow input of the first two characters of the Library of Congress classification number, so that approval volumes as well as regular purchases could be sorted into subject lists.

The Collection Development Officer should consult with the Collection Development Committee about the need for approval plan modification (such as when subject policies are developed) and with individual subject specialist/liaisons affected by proposed modifications. Annual revisions should be given to approval vendor representatives in November.

By October 1985 the Collection Development Officer should obtain and prepare the necessary current documentation, including profiles, to train subject specialist/liaisons to work effectively with the approval plans, including what to expect to be received. This training should be updated annually.

7. Serials/Periodicals Allocations

The Acquisitions Librarian has the responsibility for expending funds through the periodicals and serials accounts. Because a serial order represents an ongoing commitment for the expenditure of funds and because the inflation rate for serials has traditionally exceeded that for book materials, serial allocations must be monitored closely to determine the percent of the acquisitions budget that they consume.

For FY 85, University of Wyoming Library serial allocations represent about 45% of the total acquisitions budget. Having this low a proportion of the budget allocated to serials is a result of the recent doubling of the acquisitions budget, a large percentage of which has been used to purchase monographic materials. However the percentage devoted to serials has increased slightly the past year.

The Library has a need to build up the number of serial standing orders in order to provide support for University programs, particularly graduate programs. The limited acquisitions budgets in the past forced the Library to limit the number of standing orders and to acquire individual volumes of series. Efficient and timely acquisition of needed items in series requires standing orders. This need to build up serials in order to support University programs must be balanced against the need to control the percentage spent on standing orders.

Recommendation:

No precise percentage limit for serials is recommended. The Collection Development Officer, using figures from Acquisitions, should have the basic responsibility to monitor expenditures annually and to decide when stronger action is required to limit the percentage being

spent for serials.

Some procedures which may be helpful in monitoring serials follow. These procedures could be implemented beginning in FY 86.

1. New serial orders should be re-evaluated by the appropriate subject specialist/liaison before the end of the first or second year following new orders. These evaluations should be completed by October of each year. A written decision should be filed with the selection form. Criteria for evaluation should include indexing, actual subject coverage, and relevance to instruction and research. The selection form can be used to alert the subject specialist to titles to be checked.
2. If the item has not proved to be as useful as expected, the subscription may be cancelled at the subject specialist's request with written justification. If purchased as a faculty request, the faculty member should be consulted before the cancellation decision is made.
3. Individual collection assessments should include analyzing the pattern of information availability and use within the subject area, including what proportion of information sources are from serial literature. Evaluation of current subscriptions should be built into these subject area assessments, with cancellation of unnecessary titles following the analysis.
4. A report breaking down current standing orders by Library of Congress (LC) call numbers into subject areas should be generated either within the Acquisitions Department or by Faxon, distributed to subject specialist/liaisons, and used as a

basis for evaluating the appropriateness of standing order distribution. The Collection Development Officer should include an annual written statement about strengths and weaknesses of subject area standing orders in the information given to the subject specialists February 1 at the beginning of the annual allocations procedure. (See Appendix D, number 1.)

5. In order to balance standing order needs throughout the collection, new orders should be grouped two times a year - July and November or December. The Collection Development Officer, in consultation with subject specialist/liaisons if necessary, should evaluate these orders to see if any areas seem over or under-represented. This evaluation should be related to the report of current standing orders. If areas are under-represented, the subject specialist should be asked to determine standing orders needed and place orders. If an area is over-represented in new standing orders, the subject specialist should be asked to determine which are of lower priority and delay ordering.

8. Internal Library Allocations

Most of the acquisitions budget is allocated to internal library accounts. Some of these accounts, including approval, periodicals and serials, are high priority. Necessary adjustments are first made to other accounts. Interviews and Task Force discussions identified needs for increased flexibility for handling internal allocations, relating more clearly expensive purchases to collection development goals, and

more internal collection development support for individual subject areas.

A major initial concern of the Task Force was related to expenditures for expensive items: How and when have decisions been made regarding purchase and how have they related to collection development needs. Money has not been available for large purchases early in the year and there has been a lack of flexibility in funds. Special short-term accounts for projects have been set up usually for one or two years.

Other related concerns developed as the study progressed. As the Task Force examined the internal accounts, particularly the Reserve Fund, and tried to relate the purchase of expensive items to subject collection support, it was unable to arrive at a clear picture of overall expenditure patterns.

The approval plans are having an impact upon some internal accounts, such as Science, Interdisciplinary, Reference and Science Reference. Until the review and analysis of the approval plan purchases (as mentioned in recommendation 6) is completed, the extent of the impact cannot be determined, but some material traditionally purchased from these funds now is coming on approval.

As subject specialist/liaisons begin to purchase monographs using departmental funds, they will not need to use the two interdisciplinary accounts for purchases that fall within individual disciplines. As collecting moves to a subject rather than a department allocation, more interdisciplinary material will be justifiably purchased from the subject allocations. A need will continue for interdisciplinary funds,

but on a more limited basis.

A reserve account most commonly is used to supply funds where unforeseen shortages occur. Used in this manner the account declines throughout the fiscal year and is not used as a general account to receive reversions from other funds.

Recommendation:

By October, 1985 for use in FY 87 the Head of Acquisitions should separate internal allocations into two major groups. (See Appendix I for lists and allocation amounts of current internal funds which might be included partially or entirely in each group.)

1. Allocation funds that support individual library collections, such as reference, documents, maps, and technical service tools, and allocations that represent major ongoing committments such as periodicals, serials, and approval plans should remain essentially the same.

2. Allocations that provide material, primarily monographs, to support subject collections should be reevaluated by the Collection Development Officer and entirely or partially reallocated into a new major internal fund by FY 87. A written report on the reallocation of internal funds should be prepared, discussed, modified and approved for implementation by February 1, 1986.

The Head of Acquisitions should combine the reevaluated internal accounts, including some funds previously allocated to Reserve, Interdisciplinary and Science, into one major internal account designated by a unique letter, such as Z.

1. Reversions from other funds, including departmental or subject allocations, should go into this fund. As subject allocation amounts become based on more objective information, the allocations should be more precise, allowing less money to revert.
2. Reversions from serials and periodicals accounts should be reduced by more precise allocations. If a particular publication is not expected during a year, or if a payment is not due that year, no funds should be obligated for the subscription by the Head of Acquisitions.

The Head of Acquisitions should reduce the size of the reserve fund to approximately 3/4% or 1% of the acquisitions budget and use it to supply money in cases where unexpected expenses cause a fund to be spent out early. Any money remaining in the account should revert to the main internal Z account toward the end of the fiscal year.

Beginning in 1985 the Collection Development Officer, in consultation with subject specialists and other concerned library personnel, should annually in September evaluate the amount used in the interdisciplinary accounts the previous year and recommend adjustments to appropriate levels for the following fiscal year.

Before the beginning of the fiscal year, the Collection Development Officer should recommend sub-allocation of some of the Z funds to continuing accounts that support priority projects for the year. These priorities should be decided upon during the annual spring allocation process, and should include such areas as new programs, support for building collections following assessments, and buying collections to support certain priority subject areas. The subdivision would allow

individual subject specialist/liaisons to monitor funds for a particular project.

Expensive items costing from several hundred to several thousand dollars would be purchased from this Z fund. As requests and justifications are turned in, they should be kept by the Collection Development Officer and reviewed and prioritized by the Collection Development Committee on a regular basis, monthly or bi-monthly. As the year proceeds, it is recommended that items be ordered that meet the goals of improving the collections of the Library. The Director of Libraries should be informed of recommendations for purchases; final approval from the Director may be necessary.

1. The members of the Collection Development Committee or individual subject specialists should consider the availability of expensive items from CRL. If available, borrowing may be preferred unless heavy local demand exists for an item.
2. If an item supports a particular department or subject area, funds from that allocation should be used for part of the purchase. This support should be identified in accounting reports.

The amounts allocated to the various internal accounts should be evaluated and adjusted annually.

9. Payment of Non-material Charges/Fees From Acquisitions Funds

Acquisitions funds have been used for items that are related only indirectly to the acquisition of materials, although they are more directly related to the acquisition of information. Individual items have been carefully planned and justified to the University administration.

An overview of these expenditures and their current and projected impact on the acquisitions budget has not been undertaken. A concern has been expressed within the Library that non-material expenditures, taken from the acquisitions budget, may not represent generally accepted accounting practices.

Over the years some non-material items, including OCLC costs, CRL membership, and binding, have been paid from the acquisitions budget. In FY 84 this category accounted for $164,186.32 in expended funds or 6.6% of the total acquisitions budget. (Please see the Appendix I for a breakdown of allocations, expenditures, and percentages of serials/periodicals, monographs, and non-material items.) Costs of each of the non-material items in the acquisitions budget have grown over the years; the number of these items has also increased. Bindery charges, the original non-material expense, traditionally are included in library acquisition budgets. The first non-material addition was OCLC, which has increased in cost from $46,490.15 in FY 80 to $77,060.62 in FY 84, an increase of 65.7%. The allocation for OCLC for FY 85 is $125,000. CRL membership was added to the acquisitions budget in FY 84.

Recommendation:

The Library should work toward separating charges for non-material sources of information from the acquisitions budget by the 1989/90 biennium. These items are essential for accessing material located in the Library as well as for obtaining information located elsewhere that should be made available to faculty and students. The Task Force recognizes the importance of these non-material items and feels that this importance and need justifies their separation from the acquisitions

account. By Spring 1987, the Director of Libraries should develop and present a budget request for a separate line item for information resources, including OCLC fees, CRL membership and automated systems.

Because time limitations prevent a separate fund for non-material sources of information to be included in the FY 87-88 budget request, and these expenditures will continue to come out of the acquisitions budget, by August 1986, the Director of Libraries should prepare a general policy and justification for use of acquisitions funds for non-material sources of information, including what types of expenditures are appropriate and the relative portion of the budget that can be used for these fees. Access to information is a legitimate use of acquisitions funds, but the total amount of money spent on these items should be monitored very closely. Any additional items that might be added to this category should continue to receive approval by the Library administration and the University administration. Since other automated systems such as OCLC are paid for out of the acquisitions budget, it would appear that the cost or partial cost of an automated, on-line acquisitions system could also be justified in the acquisitions budget. The expense of an on-line, automated acquisitions system would, as described above, need to be approved by the Library administration and the University administration.

The Acquisitions Librarian should monitor the total amount of funds expended for non-material items and present a written report to the Library Director by August of each year, beginning in 1985.

10. Automated Online Acquisitions System

The need for an automated on-line acquisitions system is presented in nearly every area of concern investigated by this task force. Accurate and timely reports of all allocations funds are essential for responsible expenditures.

The doubling of the acquisitions budget has demanded extreme efforts from the acquisitions staff and has clearly demonstrated the limitations of the LARS accounting system. Since the implementation of LARS in 1973, the only significant improvement has been the recording of orders on COM (computer output microfiche). The critical improvement needed is capability for on-line interaction with the system; LARS is currently a batch-mode process with Computer Center personnel keypunching each entry. Finally, LARS on-line would still not provide many of the features of the more expensive alternative, a purchased system. An historical look at the Computer Center's responsiveness to the Library's requests for improvements in LARS does not encourage optimism about implementing improvements in the near future. Winning necessary step-by-step improvements from the Computer Center could take years and would involve much experimentation.

A purchased system would allow the Library to shop for features it desires and to require that the most necessary features be included in whatever system we acquire. Negotiating and purchasing or leasing and bringing up an externally developed system would probably take less time than working to develop our own system. Participating in a network with other members of one of the nationwide systems would create certain advantages. Also, jobbers may be more responsive to a large collective system than to an individual institution.

Recommendation:

During 1986 the Associate Director for Technical Services and the Head of Acquisitions should prepare a request for funds to acquire and maintain an automated acquisitions system. Certain features which should eventually be available include: 1) on-line interaction, 2) the flexibility to generate reports in various formats, 3) the separation of acquisition fund reports by fiscal year, 4) the automatic generation of reports for claims and cancellations, 5) the ability to order items on-line, 6) the ability to interface with the OCLC cataloging system, and 7) the ability to create an in-process file of orders in various stages of preparation. Details of these features are included in Appendix K.

APPENDIX A

CHARGE TO THE TASK FORCE ON ALLOCATIONS PRACTICES

FOCUS: The allocations of acquisition funds, both internal library accounts and departmental accounts, including procedures for allocations and expenditures.

1. The Task Force should review existing data on allocations practices in general and on the current UW Library allocation process.
   a. Relevant Spec Kits and copies of articles will be available at the beginning of the Task Force period.
   b. Interim report contains information related to the local allocation process.
   c. The previous Task Force on Aquisitions and Allocations FINAL REPORT is available.

2. In our approach to the allocation process we should identify which factors should be considered and what emphasis should be given to each.
   a. Publishing factors.
      1) Prices and inflation.
      2) Variation in subject areas by price and output.
      3) Importance of journals vs. monographs in subject areas.
   b. University factors.
      1) Program size, including numbers of students, faculty, classes.
      2) Level of terminal degree.
      3) Amount of library material needed for a course or program.
      4) Area growing or declining.
   c. Local influences.
      1) History of library allocations.
      2) Political pressures.
      3) Circulation and use of material.
   d. Specific concerns.
      1) Non-print material.
      2) Approval plans.
      3) Allocations by location.
      4) Serial vs. monograph allocations.
      5) Expensive purchases.

3. The Task Force should examine the procedure for the allocation process.
   a. Who has or should have basic authority for allocations?
   b. Who should have input into the system, what type of input, and when should that occur?
   c. What type of feedback and regular reports should various groups and individuals receive?
   d. What schedule should be followed?
   e. What information should be available as the basis for decision making?

APPENDIX A
CHARGE TO THE TASK FORCE ON ALLOCATIONS PRACTICES
Page 2

4. Once the allocations have been established, what procedures should be followed during the expenditure process?
   a. What type of schedule for the expenditures should be established?
   b. Who should have the responsibility for obligating funds?
   c. How should expensive items be handled?
   d. What type of expenditure reports should be available?

5. After examining and analyzing data related to the present system of allocations and to possible systems of allocations, the Task Force should prepare a report indicating the strengths and weaknesses of the present system and make recommendations to strengthen the allocations process. These recommendations should relate to the following areas: allocations themselves, the procedures necessary to arrive at the allocations, commmunications and reports, procedures for expenditures, and methods to evaluate and adjust the processes.

6. The written report should be presented to the CAP Study Team by October 1, 1984.

APPENDIX B

BESSLER-KEITER

ALLOCATION FORMULA

This allocation formula was devised after examining numerous library allocation plans. The formula was used as a means to compute a set of "guide" figures for departmental allocations. In order to help Committee members make informed judgments about departmental needs, the formula identified statistics in five categories: the number of faculty in each department, the number of students X credit hours - weighed by course level, the number of courses, the number of ILL book requests, and the cost per volume X the number of titles available in the discipline as listed in the B/NA Approval Plan Cost Coverage table, 1980-81.

For each department, a percentage was calculated for each category: i.e. Zoology borrowed 123 books through ILL for 6.85% of the total ILL book requests. A total average % was then calculated for each department. This % was multiplied times the total departmental pool to determine the initial "guide" allocation.

This figure was then reviewed and discussed by the Allocations Committee. The Committee considered additional statistics, including the amount departments spent on serials, the Books for College Libraries findings, the % of the departments' monies not spent in 1979, 1980, and 1981, the number of book citations listed in Masters' Theses for three sample years, the number of titles received by UW on the B/NA approval plan by discipline, and the distri-bution of Science and non-science titles received by UW on all other approval plans. Considering these factors and adding their best professional judgment about the book orientation and academic needs of the departments, the Committee made its final recommendations to the Library Director. The detailed figures used in the calculations are available on request.

APPENDIX B
ALLOCATION FORMULA
Page 2

FACTORS IN FORMULA

1. Number of faculty - this figure was taken from John Gruenfelder's handout.

2. Number of students X credit hours - this figure was taken from the 60th Annual Statistical Summary. Students X credit hours were totaled for Fall semester 1980 and Spring semester 1981. The total figure for each department was weighted as follows:

   300, 400, 500 level courses X 1
   600 level courses X 2
   700 level courses X 5
   800 level courses X 8
   900 level courses X 6½

3. Number of courses - figures are from the 1980-81 General and Graduate Bulletins.

4. ILL book requests - figures are for ILL book requests for fiscal year 1980-81.

5. Cost per volume X number of titles available - figures are from B/NA Approval Plan Cost Coverage, 1980-81.

FACTORS COUNTED FOR CONSIDERATION, BUT NOT IN FORMULA

1. Money spent on serials - 1980-81.

2. BCL Survey.

3. Allocated money not spent during past three years.

4. Book citations listed in Masters' Theses (3 theses samples for each department).

5. Number of titles received by UW on B/NA approval plan.

6. Science/non-science titles received on other approval plans.

APPENDIX C

CONTINUING OBLIGATIONS - FY 1984

FUNDS	ALLOCATIONS	EXPENDITURES
Approval	285,000	357,632.53
Binding	62,000	72,221.25
CRL Membership	13,000	14,904.45
New Periodical Subscriptions	25,000	37,247.26
OCLC Deposit	70,000	69,450.97
Periodicals	800,000	639,443.57
Serials	204,000	198,705.38
Total	$1,459,000	$1,389,605.41

SOURCE: Acquisitions Budget 1984, Acquisitions Department, University Libraries, University of Wyoming, 1985.

APPENDIX D

ANNUAL ALLOCATION PROCEDURE SCHEDULE
(BEGINNING IN 1986)

1. By February 1 the Collection Development Officer should have gathered and formated pertinent quantitative data related to Collection Development. (See Recommendation 2.) Data resulting from approval plan evaluations, standing order distribution studies, and evaluations of the effectiveness of the previous year's allocations should be included. This data will be distributed to subject specialists and others involved in the allocation process. A schedule of the allocations meetings and deadlines should be distributed also.

2. By March 1 subject specialists and others, taking into account quantitative data, subject area policies and goals, current projects, information learned from departments, and current and previous years' expenditures, should prepare an allocation recommendation for each of their individual allocation funds.

3. The Collection Development Officer and the Collection Development Committee should consider the subject specialist recommendations and develop plans for collection development for the following year in preparation for the general meeting.

4. A general meeting of subject specialists should be held around April 1. At this meeting collection development priorities for the following fiscal year should be discussed and some consensus reached. Following this meeting the Collection Development Officer should make modifications to the individual allocation recommendations, and prepare a general recommendation for all allocations funds. This should be presented to the subject specialists for further comments and possible modifications. By this time a final acquisitions budget figure should be available.

5. By May 1 the budget should be presented to the administration for approval. Further modifications may be recommended before final approval.

5. There should be an annual written evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the previous year's allocations. This evaluation should be made during August and September by the Collection Development Officer with input from subject specialist/liaisons and the Library administration. Adjustments resulting from this evaluation should become part of the data used for the following year's allocations.

APPENDIX E

SUMMARY OF FACTORS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF SOME MAJOR ALLOCATIONS FORMULAS

Bette Dillehay, "Book Budget Allocation: Subjective or Objective Approach," Special Libraries, 62 (December 1971): 509-514

Factors: correlation of previous acquisition patterns to book circulation, research output, book cost, and total research budget of institution.

This formula was developed for a special library (A.H. Robins Pharmaceutical Firm) and is not really comparable to a formula appropriate for an academic library, though methodology may provide helpful ideas.

Fabian A. Ehikhamanor, "A Formula for Allocating Book Funds: the Search for Simplicity and Flexibility," Libri, 33 (1983): 148-161.

Factors: student population (graduate and undergraduate), faculty and staff population, curriculum, new programs, collection strengths, branch libraries, circulation statistics, growth rate, proximity to other resources, literature growth, publication costs.

This formula was developed for the University of Nigeria at Ibadan, an emerging university with considerable differentials in the strengths and collection development needs of various subject areas.

Steven D. Gold, "Allocating the Book Budget: An Economic Model," College and Research Libraries, 36 (September 1975): 397-402.

Factors: University goals, prospective usage rates of subject areas, cost-benefit analysis (especially marginal cost-benefit).

Problems with this formula include difficulty of objectively measuring costs and benefits, particularly marginal ones. Does not resolve problem of equitable distribution of funds with need for economic efficiency; developed for "welfare economy." Does provide for annual re-evaluation of factor values. Kohut-Walker article criticizes Gold model.

Joseph J. Kohut, "Allocating the Book Budget: A Model," College and Research Libraries, 35 (May 1974): 192-199.

Factors: inflation projections and corrections, balancing of serial vs. monograph purchasing, concept of "funding units" rather than departments competing for "library resource units." External factors for determining proportion of l.r.u.'s per funding unit: annual publication output per subject area, rate of inflation per year for each subject area. Internal factors for determining proportions: past purchasing records.

Perceived benefit of Kohut model is its control over the direction of collection development. Also flexibility allowed by sub-division of funding units. As might be expected, Gold criticizes this model.

Joseph J. Kohut and John F. Walker, "Allocating the Book Budget: Equity and Economic Efficiency," College and Research Libraries, 36 (September 1975): 403-410.

A critique of the Gold Model.

APPENDIX E
SUMMARY OF FACTORS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF SOME MAJOR ALLOCATIONS FORMULAS
Page 2

William E. McGrath, "A Pragmatic Book Allocation Formula for Academic and Public Libraries with a Test for Its Effectiveness," Library Resources and Technical Services, (Fall 1975): 356-369.

Factors: user demand (measured by circulation statistics for subject areas), average cost of publications in subject areas, effectiveness measures of previous allocations (determined by correlation studies between current purchasing or existing distribution of subject areas in shelflist and circulation statistics for use in subject areas). Formula involves calculation of cost-use indexes by starting with a department's subject area use profile, circulation in those subject areas, and cost of materials in those subject areas to determine a percentage of a total cost-use figure for each department.

A 1969 version of McGrath's work (McGrath-Hentsinger-Barber formula) used 43 variables at the outset. These were grouped under 8 headings: books published, existing collections, faculty and faculty load, credit hours, enrollment, circulation statistics, ILL statistics, and thesis citations. Data was entered to be analyzed by a multiple correlation computer program. 21 of these variables were eliminated, although no specific description of which 21 was found in these articles.

Problems with McGrath's original model include the dependence on circulation statistics (creating an emphasis on only those needs the library can meet) and a tendency to preclude change because purchases occur most heavily in areas already best developed. It is also true that some low-use items may be very important for a small number of users, whose needs will not be met by this formula.

Thomas J. Pierce, "An Empirical Approach to the Allocation of the University Library Book Budget," Collection Management, 2 (Spring 1978): 39-55.

Factors: same as McGrath, but further elaborated.

This formula uses fairly sophisticated mathematical methods to derive measures of departmental use (e.g., a "hard-soft" index to measure book orientation of a discipline) and to coordinate these measures with literature pricing data. The phrase "The non-mathematical reader may skip ..." occurs frequently. Considerable use of logarithms. An improvement over McGrath because of increased emphasis on in-house use as well as circulation and because of a solution to the problem of biggest growth in biggest existing collections. With multiple regression analysis, Pierce develops a measure of "intensity of use" which answers this problem.

James A. Yunker and Carol G. Covey, "An Interdepartmental Allocation Formula for the Maximization of Use of Library Materials," Collection Management, 3 (Winter 1981): 363-369.

This is a further refinement on McGrath and Pierce: uses regression analysis and differential equations to mathematically formalize ideas proposed earlier for the maximization of patron use.

APPENDIX F

FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE FORMULA:

Factor	Source of Information
1. Number of faculty per department	List from Academic Affairs, arranged by department and indicating full or part time
2. Number of students enrolled per major a. graduate b. undergraduate	Annual Statistical Summary
3. Number of courses taught per department, accounting for number of credit hours per course	Catalog; Class schedules published for registration
4. Number of degrees granted per department a. Ph.D b. M.S.-M.A. c. B.S.-B.A. d. Other	Annual Statistical Summary
5. Percentage of total grant funds allotted per department for research	Annual Report of the Research Office
6. Requests and level of use in subject areas covered by a department	Shelving statistics by broad classification area; Inter-Library Loan requests; GEAC patron hold and class reserve requests
7. Publishing trends: price averages, with adustments for inflation; volume of publishing in field	Indexes such as American Book Prices, Publishers Weekly, Library Journal, Faxon Periodical Prices, Brown and Phillips Periodical Prices, approval plan reports
8. Library resource requirements of departments, including library demands of specific courses and research requirements of faculty	Biennial survey of faculty

APPENDIX F
FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE FORMULA
Page 2

Factor 8, Library resource requirements may not be as straightforward as the other factors in terms of derivation and integration into a numerical formula. This may need to be approached more as a weighting factor or an adjustment than a part of the base calculation.

APPENDIX G

BOOK FUND ALLOCATION REQUEST FORM

Department:_____

I. Quantitative Department and Program Data	(supply data for present year and four years preceding, to establish trends) 1984	1983	1982	1981	1980
A. Number of faculty (fall semester):	___	___	___	___	___
B. Number of graduate majors (fall):	___	___	___	___	___
C. Number of undergraduate majors (fall):	___	___	___	___	___
D. Number of courses offered (entire year):	___	___	___	___	___
E. Total course enrollment (entire year):					
1. Graduate:	___	___	___	___	___
2. Undergraduate	___	___	___	___	___
F. Sponsored research dollars, as percentage of total grant funds (year):	___	___	___	___	___
G. Degrees granted (year):					
1. Ph.D. - Ed.D.	___	___	___	___	___
2. M.A. - M.S.	___	___	___	___	___
3. B.A. - B.S.	___	___	___	___	___

APPENDIX G
Book Fund Allocation Request Form
Page 2

II. Quantitative Collection Data

A. Shelving (Books in appropriate subject area per year) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

B. ILL requests in appropriate Library of Congress subject classification area per year:

1. monographs: ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

2. serials: ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

3. other (specify format): ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

C. Funds obligated and expended per year:

1. monographs:
obligated: ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
expended: ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

2. serials:
obligated: ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
expended: ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

3. other (specify format):
obligated: ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
expended: ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

D. Total dollar amount of support in appropriate Library of Congress subject classification area provided by approval plans: ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

E. Cost factors:

1. Average cost per volume in subject area covered by department ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

2. Inflation projection:

a. monographs: ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

b. serials ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

c. other (specify format): ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

APPENDIX G
Book Fund Allocation Request Form
Page 3

III. Other Data

A. New faculty appointments and areas of interest in instruction and research_____

_____

B. Major ongoing research not funded by grants_____

_____

_____

C. Discontinued or declining areas of instruction and research_____

_____

_____

D. Collection goals and objectives_____

_____

_____

E. Library orientation of discipline_____

_____

_____

F. Proportion of monograph use to serial use in discipline_____

_____

_____

G. Alternatives to purchase, e.g. gifts, exchanges, shared purchase, resource sharing, depository publications_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX G
Book Fund Allocation Request Form
Page 4

IV. Request for funding Fiscal Year ____

Funds requested:

Monographs _____

Other _____

Extra internal support _____
or Z fund allotment

Total funds requested _____

Justification_____

_____

_____

Amounts approved for Fiscal Year ____

Monographs _____

Other _____

Z fund _____

Total funds approved _____

Justification_____

_____

_____

Approved by _____ Date_____

Based upon: "Sample Book Fund Allocation Request Form," in "Budget Allocation Task Force Report" Appendix F p2,3. USCD Library Collection Analysis Report: La Jolla, CA, University of California, San Diego, 1979.

APPENDIX H

SUGGESTED SUBJECT CATEGORIES FOR LIBRARY ALLOCATIONS

1. ANIMAL SCIENCES
   - Animal Science
   - Biochemistry
   - Microbiology-Veterinary Medicine
   - Zoology-Physiology

2. COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
   - Accounting
   - Agricultural Economics
   - Business Administration
   - Economics
   - Statistics

3. CONSERVATION
   - Geography
   - Parks and Recreation

4. EDUCATION
   - Ed. Administration
   - Ed. Adult Ed.
   - Ed. Counseling
   - Ed. Foundations
   - Ed. Vocational Ed.
   - School of Extended Studies
   - Science-Math Teaching
   - Special Ed.

5. ENGINEERING
   - Atmospheric Science
   - Agricultural Engineering
   - Civil Engineering
   - Petroleum Engineering

6. FINE ARTS
   - Art
   - Music
   - Theater and Dance

7. GEOLOGY

8. HEALTH SCIENCES
   - Medicine
   - Nursing
   - Paramedical Science
   - Pharmacy
   - Physical Education
   - Speech Pathology

9. HISTORICAL STUDIES
   - American Studies
   - History

10. HOME ECONOMICS

11. HUMANITIES
   - Philosophy
   - Religion

12. LANGUAGE ARTS
   - Communication
   - English
   - Journalism
   - Linguistics

13. MATHEMATICAL AND ELECTRICAL SCIENCES
   - Bio-Electrical Engineering
   - Computer Science
   - Mathematics

14. MODERN AND CLASSICAL LANGUAGES

15. PHYSICAL SCIENCES
   - Chemical Engineering
   - Chemistry
   - Physics-Astronomy

16. PLANT SCIENCES
   - Botany
   - Plant Science
   - Range Management

17. PSYCHOLOGY

18. SOCIAL SCIENCES
   - Anthropology
   - Political Science
   - Social Work
   - Sociology
   - Women's Studies

APPENDIX I

INTERNAL LIBRARY ACCOUNTS

To be considered for "Z" fund	Allocation Amounts 1982/83	83/84	84/85
Approval back run	$ 0	$100,000	$45,000
BCL project	51,000	5,000	5,000
Fine Art	15,000	25,000	25,000
Hunter Collection	0	0	11,750
Interdisciplinary	20,000	25,000	25,000
Internal Education	5,000	5,000	0
New Programs	25,000	25,000	15,000
Reserve	110,245	49,139	34,755
Science	10,000	12,000	10,000
Science Reference Retro.	9,500	4,000	0
Sheehy	0	50,000	0
Special Collections	0	1,000	1,000
Total	$245,745	$301,139	$172,505

SOURCE: Acquisitions Budget 1984, Acquisitions Department, University Libraries, University of Wyoming, 1985.

APPENDIX I
Internal Library Accounts
Page 2

Not to be considered for "Z" fund	Allocation Amounts 1982/83	83/84	84/85
Approval	$ 225,000	285,000	390,000
Binding	78,000	62,000	75,000
CRL membership	0	13,000	15,573
Data tapes	0	30,000	15,000
New data tapes	0	0	15,000
Documents	5,000	10,000	5,000
Film	40,000	50,000	50,000
Jackson Research Center	3,000	3,000	3,000
McNaughton	5,000	5,000	5,500
Maps	5,000	5,000	10,000
New subscriptions (periodicals 84/85)	25,000	25,000	25,000
OCLC deposit	74,950	70,000	135,000
OCLC regular	0	0	5,000
Outreach	0	12,000	10,000
Periodicals	800,000	800,000	850,000
Public service tools	0	0	5,000
Reference	21,594	20,000	25,000
Science Reference	8,000	8,000	8,000
Serials	204,000	204,000	290,000
New serial titles	0	0	25,000
Technical Service tools	4,000	5,500	5,500
Women's Studies	2,000	2,000	2,000
Total	$1,500,544	$1,609,500	$1,969,573

APPENDIX J

MONOGRAPHS, SERIALS, ACCESS TO INFORMATION - FY 1984

TOTAL FUNDS $2,482,967.00

	Allocated		Expended	
Serials/periodicals	$1,029,000	(41.4%)	$875,396.21	(35.3%)
Monographs (includes all other accounts)	1,453,967	(58.6%)	1,607,570.79	(64.7%)
Serials/periodicals	1,029,000	(41.4%)	875,396.21	(35.3%)
Monographs only	1,308,967	(52.7%)	1,443,384.47	(58.1%)
Access to information (bindery, OCLC, CRL)	145,000	(5.9%)	164,186.32	(6.6%)

Source: Acquisitions Budget, Acquisitions Department, University Libraries, University of Wyoming, 1985.

APPENDIX K

AUTOMATED ACQUISITIONS SYSTEM FEATURES

1. ON-LINE ACCESS. An on-line system, being interactive, would provide timely reporting of the funds. On-line access would permit more immediate updating of fund accounts and better provide material purchasers the information needed for wise and timely expenditure of the funds.

2. REPORTING FORMATS. The data on the orders should permit manipulating reporting formats for the benefit of collection development staff, the subject specialist/liaisons, and anyone else within or outside of the Libraries who desires order information in any particular area.

3. FISCAL YEAR FUNDING. Although the acquistions appropriation is biennial, the allocations are structured on separate fiscal years. Fiscal year fund reporting should maintain separate records for each year's obligations and expenditures.

4. CLAIMS AND CANCELLATIONS. The claiming and cancelling of orders is not presently being done in any systematic fashion. An online system should provide this efficiency.

5. ELECTRONIC ORDERING. Electronic ordering is available with numerous book vendors and that number will only increase. This feature would create a savings in postage and speed the order process.

6. OCLC INTERFACE. A cataloging interface with OCLC is available on the OCLC ACQs system. This capability would link and speed the processes of acquisitions and cataloging and provide a clear report of status for all items in processing.

7. ON-LINE CATALOG INTERFACE. This would eliminate manual filing of temporary order slips and expedite the integration of materials into the collection by facilitating the Cataloging Department's interaction with Acquisitions.

8. IN-PROCESS FILE. An in-process file would permit the entry of an order into the system as soon as the Acquisitions Department received the order, but before the order processing is completed and transmitted. This in-house file would reduce duplication of orders submitted to the Acquisitions Department, allow subject specialist/liaisons to estimate the dollar amount of pending orders, and know where any given order is in the process.

NOTES

[1]"Collection Analysis Project Interim Report," Laramie: University of Wyoming Libraries, 1984, p. III-5.

[2]Joyce A. Scott, "University of Wyoming Planning Guidelines for Section I of the Biennial 1985-86 Budget Request," Laramie: University of Wyoming, January, 1983, p.2.

[3]Ibid., p.3.

[4]Paul Cors, Head of Collection Development, University of Wyoming Libraries, interviewed by Allocations Task Force Members, July 30, 1984.

[5]Henry Yaple, Head of Acquisitions, University of Wyoming Libraries, interviewed by Allocations Task Force Members, July 25, 1984.

[6]Paul Cors, op.cit.

[7]"University of Wyoming Statistical Profiles," Tear Sheet, 414, August 24, 1984, p.3.

[8]Paul, Cors, Head of Collection Development, University of Wyoming Libraries, interviewed by Allocations Task Force Members, July 30, 1984. Bill Stewart, Associate Director for Technical Services, University of Wyoming Libraries, interviewed by Allocations Task Force Members, August 3, 1984. Henry Yaple, Head of Acquisitions, University of Wyoming Libraries, interviewed by Allocations Task Force Members, July 25, 1984.